Case 2:05-cv-00149-JAM-DAD Document 20 Filed 05/11/05 Page 1 of 6

McGREGOR W. SCOTT 1 United States Attorney COURTNEY J. LINN Assistant U.S. Attorney 501 I Street, Suite 10-100 Sacramento, CA 95814 Telephone: (916) 554-2700 4 5 6 7 8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 11 CIV-S-05-0149 WBS KJM Plaintiff, 12 STIPULATION AND ORDER STAYING 13 ACTION APPROXIMATELY \$1,200,000.00 IN 14 U.S. CURRENCY SEIZED FROM FIRST CALIFORNIA BANK ACCT. NO. 15 2005638, ETC., 16 Defendants. 17 18 It is hereby stipulated by and between plaintiff United States 19 20 of America and potential claimants Matthew Wallace Schachter a.k.a. Robert Lewis Brown, John W. Hollis and Judith L. Hollis, by and 21 22 23 Tri-Continental Exchange, as follows: 24

through their respective counsel, and the Provisional Liquidator of

1. As yet, no party has filed a claim or answer, or otherwise appeared in the action to contest the forfeiture. Nonetheless, potential claimant John Hollis maintains that he has an interest in the funds seized from his trust and personal accounts (\$1.2 million

28

25

26

Case 2:05-cv-00149-JAM-DAD Document 20 Filed 05/11/05 Page 2 of 6

from First California Bank, account number 2005638 and \$225,958.84 from Bank of America, account number 004653665607). According to Hollis, approximately \$54,497.79 of these funds represent payment for legal fees, costs, and expenses earned by Hollis and other legal counsel for Tri-Continental Exchange and Matthew Wallace Schachter a.k.a. Robert Lewis Brown prior to the seizure at issue. Without conceding that Hollis has standing to claim any of the defendant funds, the United States acknowledges that some of the defendant funds were in fact seized from Hollis' personal and trust accounts.

- 2. Potential claimant Matthew Wallace Schachter a.k.a. Robert Lewis Brown maintains that he is the owner of all of the funds at issue in this case, and that he intends to file a claim to such funds. Schachter is presently facing federal criminal charges in the Eastern District of California, <u>United States v. Matthew Wallace Schachter</u>, CR S-05-59 DFL, arising out of the same transactions and events which form the bases for this civil forfeiture action. For purposes of this application, the United States stipulates that Schachter has standing. To assert a claim in this proceeding. <u>See</u> 18 U.S.C. § 981(g)(2)(B).
- 3. The government of St. Vincent and the Grenadines has appointed a provisional liquidator for Tri-Continental Exchange. It is not clear at this stage whether the provisional liquidator intends to file a claim in this action. Nonetheless, the provisional

The United States previously filed a notice of related cases pursuant to 83-123, alerting the Court that this action is related to that criminal case. The Court has not determined if the two actions are related within the meaning of the Local Rule.

liquidator stipulates to the stay of this action on the terms set forth herein; provided that his agreement herein does not constitute an appearance for the purpose of submitting to the jurisdiction in this action and that his time to file a claim in this action is extended until thirty days following the expiration of this stipulation.

- 4. The parties to this stipulation recognize that proceeding with this action at this time has potential adverse affects on the prosecution of the related-criminal case and/or upon potential claimant Schachter's right against self-incrimination in the related federal criminal case. See 18 U.S.C. § 981(g).
- 5. The United States also seeks a stay for an independent reason. Recently, the court of appeals decided a case, <u>United States v. \$4,224,958.57</u>, 392 F.3d 1002 (9th Cir. 2004) ("Boylan"), that calls into question whether in a case such as this, <u>i.e.</u>, a case in which the government seeks to forfeit the proceeds of an alleged fraud scheme, the government can move for forfeiture without recognizing the rights of the victims to come forward and maintain claims in the forfeiture action itself. The <u>Boylan</u> decision arguably requires the Court to convert the forfeiture action into some sort of trust administration proceeding, and "administer that trust, giving notice to all potential claimants and taking steps to assure that no claimant obtains more than his or her fair share." <u>Id.</u> at 1005. The <u>Boylan</u> Court did not explain how this Court is to adjudicate the potential claims of Schachter and others to the seized assets, and at the same time administer a

Case 2:05-cv-00149-JAM-DAD Document 20 Filed 05/11/05 Page 4 of 6

trust for potential victims - victims that in this case may number into the hundreds and fall into different classes - much less explain what the government's role, if any, would be in such a proceeding.²

6. Counsel for the United States is advised that on March 22, 2005, the government filed a motion to stay the mandate in Boylan pending a decision by the Solicitor General whether to petition for certiorari to the Supreme Court.³ The court of appeals has yet to rule on this motion, and the Solicitor General has yet to decide whether to petition for certiorari. In view of this, and in view of the dramatic effects the Boylan decision could have on the manner in which this action is handled going forward, the government cites these potential further proceedings in Boylan as an additional justification for entering a stay.

THEREFORE the parties to this action stipulate as follows:

1. Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 981(g), and in the interests of justice, this action shall be stayed pending the conclusion of the federal criminal action presently pending against potential claimant Schachter in the Eastern District of California, or upon

Prior to the <u>Boylan</u> decision the United States generally dealt with the competing claims of large numbers of victims to forfeited assets outside the judicial process. <u>See</u> 18 U.S.C. § 981(3)(6) (authorizing the government to restore forfeited funds to the victim of the offense giving rise to forfeiture; 28 C.F.R. § 9 (regulations authorizing the Attorney General to use forfeited fund to benefit victims); <u>see also United States v. Wilcoxson</u>, CR No. S-99-359 DFL (E.D. Cal.) (a case in which pursuant to 28 C.F.R. § 9, the government has thus far restored approximately \$6,000,000.00 in forfeited assets to hundreds of victims of an investment fraud scheme).

³ The government previously filed two petition for rehearing and rehearing en banc, both of which were denied by the court of appeals.

Case 2:05-cv-00149-JAM-DAD Document 20 Filed 05/11/05 Page 5 of 6

1

the expiration of six months from the date of this order, whichever event shall occur first; 3 The Court may vacate the Status (pretrial scheduling) Conference set for May 23, 2005, at 9:00 a.m. 4 5 3. The Provisional Liquidator of Tri-Continental Exchange's execution of this stipulation does not submit him to the 6 7 jurisdiction of this Court and his time to file a claim in this 8 Action is extended until thirty days following the expiration of 9 this stipulation. IT IS SO STIPULATED. 10 11 DATED: 5/9/05 McGREGOR W. SCOTT United States Attorney 12 /s/ Courtney J. Linn 13 COURTNEY J. LINN 14 Assistant U.S. Attorney 15 16 17 Dated:5/6/05 /s/ Matthew Bockmon MATTHEW BOCKMON 18 Attorney for Potential Claimant Matthew Wallace Schachter a.k.a. 19 Robert Lewis Brown 20 21 Dated:5/9/05 /s/ Jean M. Hobler 22 MATTHEW G. JACOBS/JEAN M. HOBLER Attorney for Potential Claimants 23 John W. Hollis and Judith L. Hollis 24 25 /s/ Simon Whicker Dated: May 6 2005 26 SIMON WHICKER For the Provisional 27 Liquidator of TCE 28

Case 2:05-cv-00149-JAM-DAD Document 20 Filed 05/11/05 Page 6 of 6

For good cause shown, the Court adopts the parties' stipulation. Counsel for the United States shall cause this matter to be placed on the court's calendar for Status Conference within thirty days from conclusion of the federal criminal action presently pending against potential claimant Schachter in the Eastern District of California, or upon the expiration of seven months from the date of this order, whichever event shall occur first.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: May 10, 2005

Killiam Br Stubb

WILLIAM B. SHUBB

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE